

25. (NEVER AMENDED) An interactive data analysis support apparatus according to claim 23, wherein said graph display device comprises a rearranging device for automatically rearranging in a graph the data to be displayed according to predetermined conditions.

26. (ONCE AMENDED) An interactive data analysis support apparatus according to claim 23, wherein said graph display means comprises:

an automatic analyzing device finding a new display item by extracting a characteristic of said the data [sampled] extracted at random from said database, and a display item-adding device adding the new display item found by said automatic analyzing device to the graph.

REMARKS

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-8, 10-19, and 21-26 are pending.

Various claims are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 12 and 23 can be found throughout the Specification, including page 14, paragraph 2.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2 AND 13 FOR CONTAINING NEW MATTER

Page 2 of the Action states that the amendments to claims 2 and 13 in the previously filed Amendment contain "new matter." While the Applicant traverses the assertion that these claims contain new matter, nevertheless to remove the rejection these claims are amended to remove what was considered "new matter."

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-8, 10-19, and 21-26 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

On pages 2-5 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-8, 10-19, and 21-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Microsoft Excel 97, published by the Microsoft Corporation, 1997, pages 1-11 (Hereinafter "Excel 97").

Page 5 of the Action states, "Applicant argue that Excel 97 does not sample at random. The data sampled at random from the database is more advantageous than what is disclosed in Excel 97 since claim 1 can processed high speed, and it is not required to read all data in the database. Examiner disagrees. Excel 97 does not require the system to read all data in the database. In this case, instead of reading data of twelve months in the database, a range from January to March are sampled to be displayed. The term "sampled at random" in claim 1 does not require, nor state that the data analysis support system itself selects the random sample, therefore the interactive sampling provided for in Excel 97 is considered to be equivalent."

Independent claim 1 is amended above to recite, ". . . random extraction means for extracting data automatically at random from a database;

cross tabulation display means for displaying according to summing up conditions to set a range to be displayed a cross tabulation in which the data extracted [sample] at random from [a] the database by the random extraction means is cross summed up; . . ."

Excel 97 does not disclose the claimed random extraction means for extracting data automatically at random from a database. Excel 97 also does not disclose the claimed displaying in which the data extracted at random from the database by the random

extraction means is cross summed up. As the Examiner stated, any sampling in Excel 97 is performed under the direction of the operator, but is not performed automatically.

Therefore, in view of the above, Excel 97 cannot anticipate claim 1, and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 2-8 and 10-11 are dependent upon claim 1, which for the above reasons, should be allowed over the prior art. In addition, claims 2-8 and 10-11 recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art, and it is submitted that claims 2-8 and 10-11 are independently patentable as well.

Independent claim 12 is amended similarly to independent claim 1, and therefore, in view of the above remarks with respect to claim 1, should be allowed over the prior art.

Dependent claims 13-19 and 21-22 are dependent upon claim 12, which for the above reasons, should be allowed over the prior art, In addition, claims 13-19 and 21-22 recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art, and it is submitted that claims 13-19 and 21-22 are independently patentable as well.

Independent claim 23, in view of the above remarks, should also be allowed over the prior art.

Dependent claims 24-26 are dependent upon claim 23, which for the above reasons, should be allowed over the prior art, In addition, claims 24-26 recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art, and it is submitted that claims 24-26 are independently patentable as well.

Therefore, in view of the above remarks and amendments, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the Application is in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY

By:


Jon H. Muskin

Registration No. 43,824

700 Eleventh Street, N.W.
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 434-1500
Date: 1-24-2001